DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 085 957 EC 060 945

AUTHOR	Spivack, Frieda; Kosky, Elizabeth
TITLE	Socially Maladjusted and Emotionally Disturbed Children. Summer 1972. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Teaching and Learning Research Corp., New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.
PUB DATE	72
NOTE	81p.; Function No. 09-31607
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Community Resources; Elementary School Students; Emotional Development; *Emotionally Disturbed; *Exceptional Child Education; Mathematics; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Reading Ability; Secondary School Students; *Summer Programs; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I

ABSTRACT

A 6-week summer program (1972) provided educational, recreational, vocational, and cultural experiences for 502 elementary and secondary level socially maladjusted and emotionally disturbed children in 14 New York City facilities. Goals included consolidation of learning in areas of reading and mathematics; instruction in subject areas such as science, social studies, and art; provision for secondary students to acquire equivalency diplomas and pursue vocational training; and promotion of emotional and social growth. Evaluation was by means of seven instruments such as the Social and Emotional Growth Scale involving teacher rating of pupils; the Administrator's Form to gather information such as program organization; and the "My Summer School" questionnaire for students. Results indicated that the summer program achieved and in some cases surpassed pupil objectives, that 72% of students improved reading skills, that 69% of students improved in mathematics, and that 56% of the sampled elementary school population improved in social and emotional functioning. Also results showed failure of 75% of the facilities to provide adequate supportive services, integrated community resources, cultural and enrichment activities, and industrial and vocational services. A number of recommendations concerning funding, time schedule, and staff were made for future summer programs. (Evaluation forms are included in the appendixes.) (MC)

ED 085957

FUNCTION No. 0931607

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TEACHING & LEARNING RESEARCH CORP

SOCIALLY MALADJUSTED AND EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CHILDREN

SUMMER 1972

Board of Education of the City of New York

FINAL REPORT

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

91-31 QUEENS BOULEVARD / ELMHURST, NEW YORK / 11373 / 212 - 478 - 4340

EC 060 945

ED 085957

Function No. 0931607

FINAL REPORT

SOCIALLY MALADJUSTED AND EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CHILDREN

Summer 1972

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK

An evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10) performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1971-1972 school year.

Teaching & Learning Research Corp.
91-31 Queens Boulevard
Elmhurst, New York 11373

EVALUATION STAFF

Director:	Lee M. Joiner, Ph.D.
Principal Investigators:	Frieda Spivack, Ph.D.
	Elizabeth Kosky, Ph.D.
Research Assistant:	Paul Dawson

(Edited by Alice Shiller)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The evaluation team wishes to express their gratitude to those who made this evaluation possible, the students, teachers and administrators of the schools' visited. Special thanks are due to Mr. Jud Axelbank, Title I Coordinator, and principals of each of the cluster schools: Mr. S. Hillowitz, Mr. H. Goldberg and Mr. I.Rosenzweig, as well as Mr. S. Perlman, the principal of Rikers Island School.

PREFACE

Within every facility for the emotionally disturbed and socially maladjusted described one finds heterogeneous groups with a wide range of functioning levels and abilities. Differences are also apparent in pathology and environmental influences.

It should be pointed out that for these reasons teaching emotionally disturbed or/and socially maladjusted students requires a great deal of dedication, skill, and experience from administrators, teachers, and clinical staff. Many staff members employed at schools described in this report displayed these qualities.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Preface		iii
Table of Contents		iv
List of Tables		vi
Executive Summary		viii
I.	Program Description	1
	Sites	1
	Staffing	2
	Student Population	4
	Materials	4
	Curriculum	4
II.	Related Studies	6
III.	Procedures	8
	Program Objectives - Specific Proposed Pupil Outcomes	8
	Method Objectives - Program Process Outcomes	8
	Instrumentation	9
IV.	Analysis of Data and Results for Pupil Outcomes	12
	Pupil Outcome - Achievement	12
	Pupil Outcome - Jesness Inventory	17
	Pupil Outcome - Ancillary Analysis - Social - Emotional Scale	19
	Pupil Outcome - Ancillary Analysis - "My Summer School" Questionnaire	21
V.	Analysis of Data and Results for Program Process Evaluation	27
	Supportive Services	27
	Community Resources	27
	Enrichment Activities	28
	Vocational Areas	28
	Program Description	28
VI.	Evaluation of Instructional Approaches	43
	Curriculum	43
	Instructional Materials	44
VII.	Summary and Recommendations	45
	Summary	45
	Recommendation Regarding Funding, Time Schedule and Staff	46
	Recommendation Regarding Curriculum and Instructional Materials and Facilities	46

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Appendix A:	Program Assessment Form	48
Appendix B:	Student Vital Statistics and Student Performance Data	54
Appendix C:	Staff Information Sheet	55
Appendix D:	Administrator's Sheet	57
Appendix E:	Observation Report	60
Appendix F:	"My Summer School" Questionnaire	63
Appendix G:	Teacher Rating of Social and Emotional Growth Scale	65
Appendix H:	The Jesness Inventory	67

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 1.	Educational Experience of Staff	3
Table 2.	Summary of Reading and Mathematics Achievement	13
Table 3.	Reading and Mathematics Performance for More Than 18 Sessions and Fewer Than 18 Sessions	15
Table 4.	Summary of Reading and Mathematics Achievement, N=502	16
Table 5.	Jesness Inventory Asocial Index T Scores	17
Table 6.	Correlation Between Jesness Inventory Asocial Index and Students' Attendance at Riker's Island School	18
Table 7.	Teacher's Rating of Social and Emotional Growth	20
Table 8.	Students' Attitudes Toward Staff and Facilities	22
Table 9.	Students' Attitudes Toward School and Learning	23
Table 10.	Students' Attitudes Toward Curriculum	24
Table 11.	Students' Attitudes Toward Classmates	25
Table 12.	Students' Perception of Parental Interest in School	26
Table 13.	Program Description - Beachbrook Nursery	29
Table 14.	Program Description - Children's Day Treatment Center	30
Table 15.	Program Description - Euphrasian II-Project Outreach	31
Table 16.	Program Description - Harlem Hospital	32
Table 17.	Program Description - Hillside Hospital School	33
Table 18.	Program Description - Ittelson Center	34
Table 19.	Program Description - League School and Research Center	35

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 20.	Program Description - Lifeline Center for Child Development	36
Table 21.	Program Description - Manhattan School Residential Camp Program	37
Table 22.	Program Description - Mt. Sinai Hospital	38
Table 23.	Program Description - New York Psychiatric Institute	39
Table 24.	Program Description - Phoenix School	40
Table 25.	Program Description - Riker's Island School, P.S. 189, Bronx	41
Table 26.	Program Description - Staten Island Mental Health Center	42

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

SUMMER PROGRAM 1972 SPECIAL SCHOOLS DISTRICT 75 UMBRELLA

PROGRAM FOR SOCIALLY MALADJUSTED AND EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CHILDREN

The program entitled "Summer Program 1972, Special Schools, District 75 Umbrella; Program for Socially Maladjusted and Emotionally Disturbed Children, B/E No. 0931607 (ESEA, Title I)" was in operation from July 6 until August 15, 1972, at 14 facilities. At most facilities, the program consisted of 3 and ½ hour sessions for 29 days. Several centers had sessions for 5 hours per day and consequently terminated before August 15.

The 14 sites were located in every borough of New York City. These facilities included 1 Residential Confined School (Riker's Island), 3 Residential Treatment Schools, 1 Sleep Away Camp, and 9 non-Residential Day Treatment Schools. These centers provided a total population of 502 students with a planned program of educational, recreational, vocational, and cultural experiences.

The major goal of the summer program was to provide educational experiences to socially maladjusted and emotionally disturbed students at both the elementary and secondary levels in order to strengthen and consolidate learning in the areas of reading and mathematics. Instruction in subject areas such as science, social studies, music and art were also provided. The program sought to provide opportunities for secondary school students to acquire equivalency diplomas and pursue vocational training. Another major goal was to provide ongoing learning experiences which would promote emotional and social growth.

Proposed Pupil Outcomes

The proposed pupil outcome objectives were:

Achievement: Of all students who attend a minimum of 18 sessions of the summer program, 60% would sustain their reading and mathematical levels based upon teachers' rating of pupil performance pre and post program.

Of those children in grades K-3 who attend a minimum of 18 sessions, 60% would sustain their reading and mathematics level based upon teachers' ratings of pupil performance pre and post program.

Jesness Inventory: Sustained social and emotional development would be demonstrated by 60% of a 200 pupil group of program participants who attended 18 or more sessions of the summer program. This determination would be based upon the absence of measured regression on the Jesness Inventory.

Method Objectives -- Proposed Program Process Outcomes

The program process objectives included:

Supportive Services: Supportive services in the areas of guidance, psychology, and social work shall be adequate to meet program needs at 75% of the facilities based upon evaluator interviews and questionnaires.

Community Resources: Community resources shall be adequately utilized in the program at 75% of the facilities based upon evaluator interviews and questionnaires.

Enrichment Activities: Enrichment activities in the areas of art, music, library, health and family living shall be adequate to meet program needs at 75% of the facilities based upon evaluator interviews and questionnaires.

Vocational: Industrial arts, vocational, and home-making opportunities shall be adequate to meet program needs in 75% of the facilities serving older pupils based upon evaluator interviews, questionnaires and on site observations.

Evaluation

The evaluation of this program has been conducted by Teaching & Learning Research Corporation. Seven instruments were designed by the evaluation team to assist in the gathering and recording of pertinent data. The Student Vital Statistics and Student Performance Data Form recorded the pupil's attendance, reading and mathematics achievement, teachers' rating of students' performance, psychiatric diagnosis and attitudinal data. The Social and Emotional Growth Scale required teachers to rate pupils' pre and post program on the degree of chance in six areas of social and emotional growth. The Staff Information Sheet provided information relative to teachers' credentials, and implementation of program objectives. The Administrator's Form was devised in order to gather information about program organization, implementation, and effectiveness.

The research design called for assessing parents' perceptions of the schools' programs. This assesment was disallowed by many of the administrators in the different facilities on the basis that in these facilities parents are not encouraged to be involved with the school. This was especially true at the Riker's Island.

The "My Summer School" questionnaire provided students with an opportunity to evaluate the program. The program Assessment Form was employed by the evaluators for on site visitations to record information about the physical plant, type of activities, curriculum, educational materials, and clinical services. An Observation Report was developed to assess learning climate, instruction, and curriculum for on site visits. One standardized test, Jesness Inventory was administered pre and post program to students at Riker's Island following the requirements of the evaluation design. These instruments are appended to this report.

The instruments were distributed to the teachers and administrators by the evaluation team. Each of the 14 facilities was visited by at least two members of the evaluation team in order to assess the effectiveness of the program. Interviews were conducted with administrators, teachers, and students at each center.

Summary

The results of the analysis indicated that the summer program achieved and in some cases surpassed the expectations for the pupil outcome objectives.

Pupil Outcome - Academic Achievement: 72% of all students who attended 18 or more summer sessions were rated as improved in reading; 17.4% of these pupils sustained (remained the same) their level of achievement; and .3% regressed. In the area of mathematics, 69% of all students who attended 18 or more summer sessions were rated as improved; 20.1% sustained their level of achievement; and .6% reportedly regressed.

It was found that 45.4% of all students who attended 18 or fewer summer sessions were rated as improved in reading; 30.9% of these students sustained their level of achievement; and 1.8% regressed. In the area of mathematics, 40% of all students who attended 18 or fewer summer sessions were rated as improved; 29.2% of these students sustained their level of achievement; and 7.8% regressed.

Pupil Outcome - Social and Emotional Development: Students who attended 18 or more sessions of the summer program demonstrated an improved Asocial T score on the Jesness Inventory. Of the sampled elementary school population 56.6% were rated as improved in social and emotional functioning; 41.5% remained the same; and 1.9% regressed.

The proposed program process objectives were not all achieved by the summer program.

Supportive Services: 75% of the facilities failed to provide adequate supportive services for the program.

Community Resources: 75% of the facilities did not adequately integrate community resources into the summer program.

Enrichment Activities: 75% of the facilities did not include adequate cultural and enrichment activities in the areas of art, music, library, health and family living.

Vocational Areas: 75% of the facilities serving secondary school students failed to provide for adequate industrial arts, vocational and home-making activities.

Conclusion

Based upon the findings, the evaluation team recommends that the summer program should be recycled next year. This Title I supported program provides vital services to the socially maladjusted and emotionally disturbed students. It is hoped that some of the findings will be helpful in implementing more effective programs next summer.

Recommendations Regarding Funding, Time Schedule and Staff

1. Notification of funding should be made at an earlier date to allow sufficient time for selection of staff and ordering of instructional materials.

2. With centers having afternoon sessions, provision should be made to coordinate the part-time administrators' work hours with the scheduled hours of the centers. The geographical proximity of the various cluster schools assigned to an administrator should also be taken into account.

3. Provision should be made for orientation and planning time for teachers and administrators new to each center in order to provide better continuity in instruction.

4. More efficient payroll procedures should be put into effect. (Teachers were to be paid on a semi-monthly basis over the summer but some teachers' payroll forms were improperly handled resulting in payment being held up till the end of the summer.)

5. Time should be allotted each week for teachers to consult with professional staff to promote better communication between school and agency.

6. The practice of hiring teachers who were employed in the same schools during the school year to each during the summer should be continued. The same continuity with regard to the clinical staff, social workers or guidance counselors should be maintained over the summer.

7. Provision should be made for more supportive services (guidance counselor, school psychologists) at several of the facilities. Expansion of the guidance services for the Riker's Island site appears particularly warranted.

Recommendations Regarding Curriculum and Instructional Materials and Facilities

8. Funds should be allocated to upgrade instructional materials at certain centers. Attention should be directed toward the acquisiton of appropriate materials to allow for more individualized instruction. Materials in reading, mathematics, science, social studies and English should be supplemented with individualized labs and programmed materials.

9. Greater use should be made of community resources within the school program. Facilities at Holms, New York, might be used by other centers on a short-term basis when the Manhattan School camp is not in session.

10. Attention and study should be given to curriculum innovation. This might be accomplished by means of in-service workshops or inclusion of a curriculum specialist. Increased opportunities should be provided for students to manipulate materials with more emphasis on the process of learning.

11. A supplementary fund (petty cash) should be set up in order that teachers may use this for minor instructional materials when needs arise during the program.

12. The work study program should be extended to include additional centers serving a non-residential secondary school population.

13. Teachers should avail themselves of the materials and services offered by the Special Education Instructional Material Center to upgrade and enrich instruction.

14. Each unit or school should have clearly defined goals which are based upon a sound philosophy of education.

15. Facilities which are makeshift and/or drab and/or lacking safety measures needed for disoriented children should be upgraded.

16. Facilities having a large proportion of Spanish-speaking students should have bilingual instructors.

Chapter I PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Sites

The program entitled "Summer Program 1972, Special Schools, District 75 Umbrella; Program for Socially Maladjusted and Emotionally Disturbed Children, B/E No. 0931607 (ESEA, Title I)" was held from July 6 until August 15, 1972, at 14 facilities. The program was in operation for 29 days at most of the sites. The 14 sites were located in every borough of New York City and included facilities of various kinds: 1 Residential Confined School, 3 Residential Treatment Schools, 1 Sleep Away Camp (Manhattan School), and 9 non-Residential Day Treatment Schools. These facilities provided a total fluctuating population of 502 students with a planned program of educational, recreational, vocational, and cultural experiences.

The fourteen facilities participating in the summer program included:

I. Schools for the Severely Emotionally Disturbed

1. Day Programs

a. Lifeline Center for Child Development (P.S. 224Q)
Location: Queens

b. League School and Research Center (P.S. 162M Cluster)
Location: Brooklyn

c. Staten Island Mental Health Center (P.S. 162M Cluster)
Location: Staten Island

d. Beachbrook Nursery (P.S. 224Q Cluster)
Location: Brooklyn

2. Residential Programs

a. Henry Ittleson Research Center (P.S. 205M Cluster)
Location: Bronx

b. Manhattan School for Emotionally Disturbed Children (P.S. 224Q)
Location: Lutheran Camp, Holms, New York

II. Schools for the Socially & Emotionally Maladjusted

1. Day Programs

a. Euphrasian School (P.S. 203M Cluster)
Location: Manhattan

b. Harlem School for Child Study (P.S. 224Q Cluster)
Location: Manhattan

c. Phoenix School (P.S. 205M Cluster)
Location: Manhattan

d. Children's Day Treatment Center (P.S. 205M Cluster)
Location: Manhattan

2. Residential Program Prison Population

a. Riker's Island School (P.S. 189 BX)
Location: Riker's Island

3. Schools for the Socially and Emotionally Maladjusted Located in Mental Hospitals

a. Hillside Hospital (P.S. 205M Cluster)
Location: Queens

b. Mt. Sinai Hospital (P.S. 368K Cluster)
Location: Manhattan

c. New York Psychiatric Institute (P.S. 186 BX Cluster)
Location: Manhattan

At most facilities, the program consisted of 3 and ½ hour sessions per day. Those facilities that had sessions for 5 hours per day or more terminated their programs before the others.

Staffing

The 14 facilities geared their program to meet the needs of the exceptional student population they served. Therefore a low pupil-teacher ratio was maintained and specialists were provided for intensive clinical and remedial services. In many cases, regular members of the school's staff were employed for the summer program. Thus, every facility had some staff members who knew the students and were aware of their needs.

The educational level and experience of the staff are presented in Table 1. Information relative to the professional qualifications of the program personnel was gathered from Staff Information Sheets.

TABLE 1

EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCE OF STAFF
TEACHING STAFF

Highest Education Level # B.A.	# M.A.	# M.A.+15	# M.A.+30	Experience Average # Yrs. in this position	# Teachers same school during year	Area of Specialization # Spec. Educ.	List Other areas
22	25	1	9	Less than 1 - 10 1 yr - 10 2 yrs.- 6 3 yrs.- 7 4 yrs.- 3 5 yrs.- 8 6 yrs.- 2 7 yrs.- 2 8 or more yrs. - 8	Yes - 34 No - 23	33	Elem.Ed.5 Ed. - 9 Sci. - 3 Lib.Art.5 Health Ed.1
				PRINCIPALS			
	3		1	2 yrs. - 1 3 yrs. - 2 Greater than 10 yrs. - 1	Yes - 4	3	Ed. - 1

To summarize:

22 teachers held Bachelor's Degrees, 25 Master's Degrees, while 10 had pursued graduate work beyond the Master's level. Training in Special Education was reported by 33 teachers. Years of teaching experience varied. Only 10 teachers were relatively inexperienced. The majority of the teachers employed in the summer program had several years experience. It was found that 34 teachers were members of the same staff during the regular school year while 23 were new.

The administrators employed in the summer program all held at least a Master's Degree. All were experienced and familiar with the

population served by the program. Although the principals were employed in the same capacity during the regular school year, the schools included in each cluster could differ. Therefore, principals were not always familiar with his particular center or staff.

Student Population

The summer program was planned for approximately 590 students in toto: 300 secondary students and 290 elementary students. There were to be 45 elementary teachers and 27 secondary teachers. There were three clusters of schools not including Rikers Island, each administered by a part-time principal, but having a teacher-in-charge. On Rikers Island 4 teachers were responsible for the direct supervision of the instructional program. In other facilities, teachers in charge were assigned as follows: 1 for Psychiatric Hospitals, 2 for the day and residential treatment centers, and 1 for Rikers Island. The programs, exclusive of Rikers Island, were to have one teacher assigned, a trip coordinator, and a teacher assigned as a general assistant.

In actuality there were 502 students, 57 teachers (including teachers-in-charge), and 4 principals. Teachers were not assigned as trip coordinators or general assistants.

Materials

According to the design of the program, materials of instruction were to be similar to those used during regular school year. However, newer adaptations and approaches were to be attempted wherever possible. Particular emphasis was to be placed upon trips, library, art, music and health activities. Educational matter such as workbooks, as well as testing materials, and paper, crayons, and other supplies were to be provided.

Curriculum

The major goal of the summer program was to provide educational experiences to socially maladjusted and emotionally disturbed students at both the elementary and secondary levels. In this way learning, particularly in the areas of mathematics and reading, that had taken place during the school year would be strengthened and consolidated.

Another major goal was to provide on-going learning experiences which would promote emotional and social growth, especially in the areas of peer-peer interaction and adult-child interaction.

Curriculum for children in the elementary grades was geared to each child's level of development and rate of learning. In most cases the groups were non-graded and small group instruction was provided. Instructional materials were carefully selected to meet the level of achievement and to meet the strengths and weaknesses of each child. These schools tended to work closely with the clinical staff of the agency or hospital involved.

Education of the child was seen as part of a larger treatment program. Instruction at the early childhood level stressed language, gross motor skills and readiness for reading and mathematics. At the middle school level specific reading skills and mathematics concepts were emphasized. Science, social studies, music and art were also provided.

Curriculum for the secondary school level offered opportunities to acquire equilvalency diplomas or pursue training in the various business and vocational areas. At Riker's, the guidance program was an important adjunct to the instructional program.

Chapter II RELATED STUDIES

This is the third recycling of the summer program for socially maladjusted and emotionally disturbed students. Schneider and Forlano investigated the 1970 summer program. They sought to assess the following:

1. Remediation in skills with emphasis on reading and mathematics.
2. Improvement in interpersonal and social development in the areas of self-concept, relationships with peers and authority figures, community relationships, and attitudes toward school and learning.
3. Influence of cultural enrichment for deprived students.
4. Parental attitude toward program and relationships between school and home.
5. Effectiveness of the program.
6. Implementation of the program.

Their investigation revealed these results:

1. Progress in reading and mathematics was reported by teachers inclusive of all grades.
2. Ratings (by teachers) suggested improved social and emotional functioning with regard to individual and group adaptation.
3. Recreational and cultural activities were seen as valuable social and educational experiences.
4. Supervisory ratings indicated positive attitudes of parents toward the staff and program.
5. Special services and materials contributed to the effectiveness of the program.

Hollingshead and Weiss (1971) examined the effectiveness of the 1971 summer program. They sought to determine these points:

1. Maintenance of reading and mathematics levels by 75% students who have attended a minimum of 18 sessions.

2. Demonstration of improved social and emotional functioning by 75% of the students attending 18 or more sessions.

3. Organization and implementation of the program.

4. Learning climate of each of the facilities.

5. Professional qualifications of the personnel.

Their findings indicated that

1. Over 75% of the students attending 18 or more sessions sustained their level or improved in reading and mathematics as measured by informal tests.

2. Growth in social and emotional development was below expectations as determined by an attitudinal scale.

3. The learning climate of each facility varied according to the unique characteristics of the subjects and the educational philosophy of the center. Climates ranged from permissive to highly structured. It was noted that regression in social and emotional behavior was found in the more traditional settings.

4. The staff had adequate experience and training.

Chapter III PROCEDURES

The overall objectives of the program were to sustain and improve reading levels, promote social and emotional growth, and provide cultural enrichment.

Program Objectives - Specific Proposed Pupil Outcomes

1. For those children from grades 4 and higher who attended a minimum of 18 sessions of the summer program it was anticipated that 60% would sustain their reading and mathematics levels. Whether this objective was accomplished or not would be evaluated by a specially prepared pupil performance data form. Teachers would use it to rate pre- and post-program pupil performance in the areas of reading and mathematics.

2. For those children in grades K-3 who attended a minimum of 18 sessions, 60% of the children would show sustained progress in their reading and math levels. A specially prepared pupil performance data form would be used by program teachers to rating pre- and post-program pupil performance in the areas of reading and mathematics.

3. Sustained social and emotional development was to be demonstrated by 60% of a 200 pupil group of program participants who attended 18 or more sessions of the summer program. Satisfactory social and emotional development was defined as the absence of measured regression utilizing the ' 'Jesness Inventory' (Buros; 7th Mental Measurements Yearbook, Gryphen Press).

Evaluation Method

At the end of the program each teacher rated each pupil by filling out the specially prepared pupil performance data form. Each pair of pupil ratings was reducible to one of four categories; improved, sustained (or same), regressed, and undetermined. Once tables were made from this data, pupil attendance in the summer program could be associated with achievement. The results for those pupils who attended a minimum of 18 sessions were used to determine the achievement of the program objective.

The evaluators used 105 matched pupils' pre- and post-tests at the Riker's Island site. Judgment of regression was based upon procedures appropriate to the Jesness Inventory.

Method Objectives - Program Process Outcomes

1. The achievement of the program process objectives listed below was to be demonstrated in the judgments recorded by program administrators, program staff members, students in the program, and the observing evaluators:

A. Supportive service in the areas of guidance should be adequate to meet program needs in 75% of the facilities.

B. Community resources should be adequately utilized in program of 75% of the facilities.

C. Enrichment activities in the areas of art, music, library activities, health and family living should be adequate to meet program needs in 75% of the facilities.

D. Industrial arts, vocational, and home-making educational activities should be adequately provided to meet program needs (particularly in those program components serving older pupils) in 75% of the facilities.

Evaluation Methods

Judgments regarding the accomplishment of these objectives were obtained by interviews conducted by evaluators, and/or questionnaires prepared by evaluators and utilized by representatives of the following groups: program administrators, program staff members, and students.

The research design originally called for assessing parents' perceptions of the schools' programs. Many of the administrators in the different facilities disallowed this on the basis that in these facilities parents are not encouraged to be involved with the school. This situation was especially true at the Rikers Island.

Instrumentation

Seven instruments were designed by the evaluation team to assist in gethering and recording of pertinent data. One instrument, a commercially manufactured test, Jesness Inventory, was given only to students at Riker's Island following the requirements of the evaluation design. The following lists all the instruments used in evaluation.

1. Student Vital Statistics and Student Performance Data Form.
2. Social and Emotional Growth Scale.
3. Staff Information Sheet.
4. Administrator's Form.
5. Program Assessment Form.
6. Attitudinal Scale - "My Summer School" Questionnaire.
7. Observation Report.
8. Jesness Inventory Test.

Record Forms

All teachers recorded this information about their students:

1. Name
2. School
3. Chronological age
4. Attendance at summer program.

Questionnaires

Questionnaires that were completed by the teachers and principals in the summer program included the Staff Information Sheet which provided information about

1. Educational background
2. Experience in special education
3. Employment in same program during the regular school year
4. Educational goals
5. Implementation of program
6. Curriculum and innovation
7. Recommendations for improvement of the program.

All principals completed the Administrator's Form to give data on

1. Program organization
2. Goals and implementation of the program
3. Program effectiveness
4. Administrative effectiveness
5. Recommendation for improvement of the program
6. Recruiting and hiring
7. Duties and responsibilities.

The following directly involved the students:

Jesness Inventory was administered to the Riker's Island population at the beginning and end of the summer program. This instrument provided an index of a student's Asocial behavior.

"My Summer School" Questionnaire was administered to a sample of students from each center (with the exclusion of Riker's Island) who were reading at least fifth-grade level. This questionnaire provided information concerning student attitudes toward

1. Staff and facilities
2. School and learning
3. Curriculum
4. Classmates
5. Parental interest in school.

Rating Scales

The Student Vital Statistics and Student Performance Data Form provided pre- and post-program comparisons in the areas of reading and mathematics. Teachers rated each student as improved, sustained, regressed, or undetermined in both reading and mathematics.

Social and Emotional Growth Scale provided pre- and post-program comparison in social and emotional development. Teachers rated each student on a 5 point scale with regard to 1) self-image, 2) self-control, 3) frustration tolerance, 4) independence, 5) socialization with peers, 6) relationships with school personnel.

Interviews

All principals and teachers in charge were interviewed at their centers by the evaluation team. The Program Assessment Form was employed by the evaluators upon visiting each of the 14 centers. The structured interview was used to obtain information regarding

1. Physical setting
2. Program description
3. Educational materials, equipment and materials
4. Curriculum experiences
5. Clinical services
6. Parental involvement in the program.

On-Site Observations

Each center was visited by the evaluation team and research assistant during the summer program. Designated classes were observed for a minimum of twenty minutes at each center. The Observation Report was employed to record information about

1. Climate of the classroom
2. Description of lesson
3. Student participation
4. Curriculum
5. Educational materials.

Chapter IV ANALYSIS OF DATA AND RESULTS FOR PUPIL OUTCOMES

Pupil Outcome - Achievement

This section of the report is organized to correspond with the objectives of the evaluation design.

The evaluation design hypothesized that grades K-3 and grades 4-12 would sustain their levels in reading and mathematics based upon teacher judgment. These behavioral objectives could not be determined using the grade designations of K-3 and 4-12 of the evaluation design. The evaluation team found that for the most part the schools were ungraded, and a wide range of achievement existed in each school. The schools themselves thought of their population as elementary schools (K-6) or secondary schools (7-12). As it turned out, those schools which were suppose to serve a K-12 population had a more restrictive population over the summer months. Consequently, many could be characterized as having either an elementary or a secondary population.

As noted in Table 2, the schools for severely disturbed children were for the most part elementary schools serving grades K-6. Schools for socially and emotionally maladjusted were for the most part secondary schools serving grades 7-12.

A number of children in the elementary program gave evidence of little or no verbal language, not only as a function of age but also by reason of severe disturbance and developmental level. Therefore, some students whose chronological ages placed them in grade 4, could not possibly achieve in reading and mathematics. The only category which could be used to describe their functioning in school subjects was "undetermined."

This is clearly the reason schools for the severely emotionally disturbed rated 38.4% of their children as undetermined (average total) in reading, while 62% were rated as improved and sustained (combined average total) in reading. One would suspect that more of these children would regress in reading and mathematics since their attention, behavior and performance are intrinsically tied to their emotional ups and downs. The same results are seen in mathematics as in reading and the same analysis can be inferred. Severely emotionally disturbed students were rated as undetermined, 41.4% (average total), while 58% were rated improved and sustained (combined average total) by their teachers (see Table 2). Whereas, in schools for socially maladjusted and emotionally disturbed students for the most part serving grades 7-12, performance ratings by teachers were different.

Only 4.7% (average total) of students were rated as undetermined in reading and 2.9% (average total) were rated undetermined in mathematics. A combined average total score of 95% (see Table 2) were rated as improved or sustained in mathematics performance. Therefore, age in combination with pathology played an important part in rating student performance.

Achievement in reading and mathematics were combined for all schools and comparisons were made with regard to attendance (see Table 3). The evaluation team decided this was being "even handed" in measuring the success of the entire summer program, grades K-12 (a total population of 487 was used for Table 3 since a few schools omitted students' attendance).

TABLE 2

COMPARISON BETWEEN ACHIEVEMENT IN READING AND MATHEMATICS IN SCHOOLS FOR SEVERELY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED AND IN SCHOOLS FOR THE SOCIALLY AND EMOTIONALLY MALADJUSTED

Schools for Severely Disturbed Children (Grades K-6 for the most part)	# of Pupils	% Pupils Undetermined in Reading	% Pupils Improved in Reading	% Pupils Sustained in Reading	% Pupils Regressed in Reading	% Pupils Undetermined in Math	% Pupils Improved in Math	% Pupils Sustained in Math	% Pupils Regressed in Math
Life Line	25		84.0	16.0			77.0	23.0	
Staten Island	23	17.5	70.5	12.0		23.5	29.5	47.0	
League School	31	75.9		20.7	3.4	75.9	20.7		3.4
Beachbrook	8	83.4	16.6			100.0			
Ittelsen Center	21	8.6	26.1	65.3		4.3	26.1	69.6	
Manhattan School	131	45.2	6.4	45.2	3.2	45.2	3.2	45.2	6.4
TOTAL POPULATION	239								
AVERAGE PERCENT		37.0	32.0	30.0	1.0	38.0	27.0	33.0	2.0

TABLE 2 Continued

COMPARISON BETWEEN ACHIEVEMENT IN READING AND MATHEMATICS IN SCHOOLS FOR SEVERELY EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED AND IN SCHOOLS FOR THE SOCIALLY AND EMOTIONALLY MALADJUSTED

Schools for Socially and Emotionally Disturbed Children (Grades 7-12 for the most part	# of Pupils	% Pupils Undetermined in Reading	% Pupils Improved in Reading	% Pupils Sustained in Reading	% Pupils Regressed in Reading	% Pupils Undetermined in Math	% Pupils Improved in Math	% Pupils Sustained in Math	% Pupils Regressed in Math
Euphrasian	14		92.8	7.1			92.8	7.1	
Harlem School	21		76.2	23.8			76.2	23.8	
Phoenix School	9		45.0	55.0			55.0	45.0	
Children's Day	23	13.0	87.0			30.4	65.3	4.3	
Riker's Island	178		79.2	20.2	.6		78.1	20.2	1.7
Hillside Hosp.	56		100.0				100.0		
Mt. Sinai	32	8.7	30.5	56.5			54.6	36.4	
N.Y. Psychiatric	30	16.3	69.1	14.6		23.6	58.2	18.2	
TOTAL POPULATION	363								
AVERAGE PERCENT		3.0	77.0	19.0	2.0	5.0	76.0	18.0	1.0

TABLE 3

READING AND MATHEMATICS PERFORMANCE FOR MORE THAN 18 SESSIONS AND FEWER THAN 18 SESSIONS

READING AND MATHEMATICS PERFORMANCE SUMMARY FOR PUPILS IN ALL GRADES ATTENDING 18 SESSIONS OR MORE

	READING		MATHEMATICS	
Pupils	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Improved	232	72.0	223	69.0
Same	56	17.4	64	20.1
Undetermined	33	10.3	33	10.3
Regressed	1	.3	2	.6
TOTALS	322	100.0	322	100.0

READING AND MATHEMATICS PERFORMANCE SUMMARY FOR PUPILS IN ALL GRADES ATTENDING FEWER THAN 18 SESSIONS

	READING		MATHEMATICS	
Pupils	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Improved	75	46.4	64	40.0
Same	53	30.9	49	29.2
Undetermined	34	20.9	39	23.0
Regressed	3	1.8	13	7.8
TOTALS	165	100.0	165	100.0

TABLE 4

SUMMARY OF READING AND MATHEMATICS ACHIEVEMENT
N=502

Schools	# Pupils on Register	Teacher Pupil Ratio	% Pupils Improved in Reading	% Pupils Sustained in Reading	% Pupils Regressed in Reading	% Pupils Undetermined in Reading	% Pupils Improved in Math	% Pupils Sustained in Math	% Pupils Regressed in Math	% Pupils Undetermined in Math
Lifeline	25	1:5	84.0	16.0			77.0	23.0		
Staten Island	23	1:2.7	70.5	12.0		17.5	29.5	47.0		23.5
Mt. Sinai	32	1:8	30.5	56.5		8.7	54.6	36.4		
Riker's	178	1:10.4	79.2	20.2	.6		78.1	20.2	1.7	
League	31	1:2.8		20.7	3.4	75.9		20.7	3.4	75.9
Euphrasian	14	1:4.6	92.8	7.1			92.85	7.1		
Phoenix	9	1:3	45.0	55.0						
Child. Day Treatment	23		87.0			13.0	65.3	4.3		30.4
Psychiatric	30	1:5	69.1	14.6		16.3	68.2	18.2		23.6
Manhattan	31	1:6.2	6.4	45.2	3.2	45.2	3.2	45.2	6.4	45.2
Beachbrook	8	1:2.6	16.6			83.4				100.0
Hillside	56	1:9.3	100.0			100.0	100.0			
Harlem	21		76.2	23.8		76.2	76.2	23.8		
Ittleson	21	1:3.5	26.1	65.3		26.1	26.1	69.6		4.3
TOTAL	502									

Results of the analysis of Table 2 indicated that the summer program 1972 surpassed its objectives in the areas of achievement of pupils who attended 18 or more sessions, in both mathematics and reading. More than 89% sustained or improved their performance in reading at the same time more than 89% sustained or improved in mathematics (see Table 3).

Pupils who attended fewer than 18 sessions also surpassed program expectations although to a lesser degree. These comparisons emerged:

1. Nearly 2% of pupils attending fewer than 18 sessions were perceived as "regressed" in reading, while .3% of pupils attending more than 18 sessions were rated as regressed in reading.

2. Nearly 8% of pupils attending fewer than 18 sessions were perceived as "regressed" in mathematics, while .6% attending more than 18 sessions were rated as "regressed" in mathematics.

3. Nearly 26% more of the reported pupils attending 18 or more sessions were rated as "improved" in reading than those attending fewer sessions.

4. Nearly 30% more of the pupils attending 18 or more sessions were rated as "improved" in mathematics than those attending fewer sessions.

In actuality, using less than or more than 18 sessions was not a practical dividing line. Two programs were conducted for a total of only 18 days, but covered 5 hours or more per day. If, indeed, number of hours of instructional activity were counted, these concentrated instructional programs would raise the percent of improvement to a higher level.

Pupil Outcome - Social and Emotional Development

Jesness Inventory Asocial Index was used as a measurement of social and emotional development for the Riker's Island students as set forth by the evaluation design. According to Table 5 below, the Asocial Index pretest score was higher than the post-test score. This indicates that there was a 3 point drop of the Asocial Index or asociability at the end of the summer program.

TABLE 5

JESNESS INVENTORY ASOCIAL INDEX T SCORE

	N	Mean	SD	t
Pretest	106	69.840	8.590	
Posttest	106	66.887	12.195	2.239

The population at Riker's Island was in a constant flux, so that only 106 out of a possible 178 students took both the pre-test and post-test of Jesness Inventory. Records indicated that only 94 attended more than 18 sessions of the instructional program. Therefore, one can infer that more than 60% of this population was able to sustain or improve their scores on the Jesness Inventory. The evaluation team questions the significance of these scores since the interval between pre-test and post-test was only one month. It should be noted that a mean T-score of the Asocial Index of a group of 40 minor offenders as reported in the Jesness Inventory Manual was 57.7. Mean T-scores in Table 5 ranged from 69-66. These are significantly high scores.

TABLE 6

CORRELATION BETWEEN JESNESS INVENTORY ASOCIAL INDEX AND STUDENTS' ATTENDANCE AT RIKER'S ISLAND SCHOOL

	FEWER THAN 18 SESSIONS			
	Pupils	Mean	SD	
PRETEST	18	66.83	7.87	
POST-TEST	68	63.29	12.84	t=1.0536
	MORE THAN 18 SESSIONS			
	Pupils	Mean	SD	
PRETEST	18	70.04	8.89	
POST-TEST	68	66.51	10.13	t=2.519

An analysis of these results revealed that students at Riker's Island attending more than, or fewer than 18 sessions improved in terms of change of attitude toward delinquency. Therefore, this points to the effectiveness of their treatment at Riker's Island. It should be noted that the difference between 3.53 points and 3.54* points wasn't appreciable. However, the number of students affected by treatment gives us a higher t score. As is often the case when a program is short term, forms are misplaced or not handled properly. This resulted in a reduced population of 86 students for this analysis.

*It should be noted that the difference between the means for fewer than 18 sessions was 3.54 points. The difference between the means for more than 18 sessions was 3.53 points. Therefore, the difference between the means of these two groups was not appreciable.

Pupil Outcome - Ancillary Analysis - Social-Emotional Scale

An ancillary analysis of the social and emotional growth of a random sample of students was conducted. Teachers compared social and emotional functioning pre and post summer program. Students were rated on a 5 point scale (1 much worse; 2 worse; 3 about the same; 4 better; and 5 much better) for 6 categories. The six areas studied included: self-image, self-control, ability to tolerate frustration and anxiety, independence, socialization with peers, and ability to relate to school personnel.

Teachers indicated 64% of the students manifested improvement in self-image while 35% remained the same. Less than 2% regressed. Improvement in self-control was reported for 49% of the students. Approximately 48% showed little or no improvement. Slightly more than 3% regressed. Teachers maintained that 58% of the students manifested higher levels of frustration tolerance and lower anxiety while 40% remained the same. Less than 2% regressed. More than 53% of the students were viewed as more independent. Approximately 45% remained the same. Only 2% were judged as more dependent. It was disclosed that 53% of the students evidenced improved ability to socialize with peers. Almost 47% sustained their level of functioning. Less than 1% regressed. Similarly, 53% evidenced improved ability to relate to school personnel while 36% remained constant. Only 2% were judged as regressed.

The results indicated that almost 57% of the students were rated as improved in 6 areas of social and emotional development while 42% remained constant. It was found that more than 60% of the students sustained or improved in the area of social and emotional functioning. Teachers' ratings for each of the six areas and percentages are contained in Table 7.

TABLE 7

TEACHERS' RATING OF SOCIAL & EMOTIONAL GROWTH

ITEM	% 1 much worse	% 2	% 3 about the same	% 4	% 5 much better
Pupil's self-image	0.0	1.3	34.7	38.7	25.3
Pupil's self-control	0.5	2.9	47.7	28.1	20.8
Pupil's ability to tolerate frustration and anxiety	0.0	1.7	39.9	37.5	20.9
Pupil's ability to function independently	0.4	1.9	44.5	34.5	18.7
Pupil's ability to socialize with peers	0.0	1.3	46.9	37.3	14.5
Pupil's ability to relate to school personnel	0.3	1.7	36.4	34.5	18.1
Average %	.2	1.7	41.5	36.9	19.7

Pupil Outcome - Ancillary Analysis - "My Summer School" Questionnaire

An ancillary analysis of students' perception of the summer school program was conducted. The response of a random sample of students to the "My Summer School" Questionnaire is reviewed in this section. Items contained in the questionnaire were divided into five categories. These included: Students' Attitudes toward Staff and Facilities; Students' Attitudes toward School and Learning; Students' Attitudes toward Curriculum; Students' Attitudes toward Classmates; and Students' Perception of Parents' Interest in School.

Students' Attitudes Toward Staff and Facilities

In general, the items pertaining to school personnel and facilities revealed favorable perceptions. Approximately 86% strongly agreed with the statement that teachers wanted to help them. Only 1% disagreed. Similarly, more than 80% felt that teachers helped them when they needed it. Less than 5% disagreed. More than 67% tended to perceive teachers as interested in them most of the time, while 29% felt this was true some of the time. Only 4% viewed teachers as disinterested in them. Over 60% of the students maintained that teachers explained things clearly most of the time. Almost 36% disclosed this was true some of the time. Approximately 4% disagreed with the statement. Generally, teachers were perceived as "fair and square." More than 57% stated that this was true most of the time, while 30% felt it was true some of the time. Slightly less than 13% disagreed. Students differed in their reactions to teachers' expectations. It was found that 45% perceived teachers' expectations as realistic most of the time, while 25% thought this was true some of the time. In contrast, 30% perceived teachers as expecting them to work too hard.

Approximately 72% of the students reported that the principal was friendly most of the time, while 19% agreed this was true some of the time. Only 9% viewed administrators as unfriendly. More than 46% of the students reported that guidance counselors, psychologists, or social workers were available most of the time. In contrast, 17% maintained that the professional staff was not available when needed.

The school building was perceived as a pleasant place most of the time by 55% of the students, while 25% felt this was true some of the time. However, 20% of the students viewed the facilities negatively. Generally, responses indicated positive attitudes toward teachers, administrators, and facilities. Statements and percentages are presented in Table 8.

TABLE 8

STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD STAFF AND FACILITIES

	Statement	% Yes	% Sometimes	% No
1.	The teachers in this school want to help you.	85.9	13.3	.8
16.	My teacher helps me when I need it.	80.4	14.7	4.9
3.	The teachers in this school are really interested in you.	67.2	28.7	4.1
4.	The teachers in this school know how to explain things clearly.	60.3	35.5	4.2
5.	The teachers in this school are fair and square.	57.4	30.0	12.6
2.	The teachers in this school expect you to work too hard.	30.0	25.2	44.8
8.	The principal in this school is friendly.	72.2	18.8	9.0
20.	When I need to talk to someone, the guidance counselor, or psychologist or social worker in this program are available.	46.4	36.2	17.4
7.	This school building is a pleasant place.	55.0	25.0	20.0

Students' Attitudes toward School and Learning

In general, students viewed school as a valuable experience. Approximately 68% of the students felt that going to school was one of the most important things they could do. Less than 11% of the pupils viewed school as unimportant. However, attitudes toward attending summer school varied. More than 34% disclosed favorable attitudes toward summer school, while 33% expressed ambivalent feelings. Negative attitudes were reported by slightly more than 33% of the students. Approximately 51% of the students felt that the center was one of the best schools ever attended. Less than 33% disagreed.

Statement and percentages relative to students' attitude toward school and learning are seen in Table 9.

TABLE 9

STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL AND LEARNING

	Statement	%Yes	%Sometimes	%No
17.	Going to school is one of the most important things you can do.	67.6	21.8	10.6
12.	I wish I didn't have to go to (summer) school at all.	33.3	32.6	34.1
13.	This is the best school I know.	50.8	16.7	32.5

Students Attitudes Toward Curriculum

In general, positive attitudes were reported with regard to curriculum. Subject matter was perceived as useful by more than 68% of the students. Approximately 19% felt that the curriculum was meaningful some of the time. In contrast, 13% expressed negative attitudes toward the subject matter. Slightly less than 63% of the students reported that the work was not too hard most of the time, while 28% perceived the material as difficult. Similar results were found for the parallel item. Approximately 15% of the students reported that the work was too easy most of the time while 47% felt this was true some of the time. In contrast, 38% did not view the curriculum as too easy. On a similar item, only 21% of the students felt that they worked hard but didn't get anywhere. More

than 26% disclosed that this was true some of the time. Almost 53% disagreed with the statement. Generally, students tended to perceive the subject matter and level of difficulty as appropriate. The statements and percentages relative to students attitudes toward curriculum are presented in Table 10.

TABLE 10

STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD CURRICULUM

	Statement	%Yes	%Sometimes	%No
10.	What I am learning will be useful to me.	68.1	18.5	13.4
9.	The work at this school is too hard.	9.8	27.7	62.5
14.	The work at this school is too easy.	15.3	46.8	37.9
15.	I work hard in school but don't seem to get anywhere.	20.9	26.4	52.7

Students' Attitudes Toward Classmates

Generally, students tended to express favorable attitudes toward classmates. More than 54% stated that classmates were "pretty nice" most of the time. Only 12% viewed classmates in a negative manner. Likewise, on a parallel item, more than 54% disagreed with the statement that classmates fought too much, less than 21% thought this was true some of the time. In contrast, 25% of the students viewed their classmates as aggressive. The statement and percentages relative to students' attitudes toward classmates are seen in Table 11.

TABLE 11

STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD CLASSMATES

	Statement	%Yes	%Sometimes	%No
18.	The boys and girls in my class are pretty nice.	54.1	33.8	12.2
6.	The boys and girls in this school fight too much.	25.4	20.5	54.1

Students' Perception of Parental Interest in School

Over 58% of the students perceived their parents as interested in their work at school most of the time while 20% felt this was true some of the time. Only 22% of the students tended to view their parents as disinterested in their academic progress.

TABLE 12

STUDENTS' PERCEPTION OF PARENTAL INTEREST IN SCHOOL

	Statement	%Yes	%Sometimes	%No
19.	My parents never listen when I talk about school.	21.6	20.1	58.3

Chapter V ANALYSIS OF DATA AND RESULTS FOR PROGRAM PROCESS EVALUATION

Supportive Services

Objective: supportive services in the area of guidance psychology and social work shall be adequate in 75 percent of the facilities.

Results of the questionnaires, interviews with teachers and principal, and on site visitations revealed that 75% of the facilities did not have adequate supportive services. Only one program was staffed with a guidance counselor. Both administrators and staff felt that the guidance counselor was a valuable asset to the summer program. However, it was maintained that the size of the case load greatly reduced his effectiveness. The need for the expansion of guidance services was reported. Most centers reported that professional services were greatly reduced during the summer program. In one case a program in language development and perceptional training was discontinued due to budget constraints. Mostly, professional services were supplied by either the agency or hospital with which the school was affiliated. The quality of clinical services were excellent in most agency and hospital affiliated centers. Adequate provisions were made for individual and group therapy for the student and his family. Parents were actively involved with the clinical staff and school program at most centers.

The existence of supportive services within each center is found in figure program descriptions.

Community Resources

Objective: community resources should be adequately used by 75% of the facilities.

Interviews with principals and teachers, questionnaires, and on site visitations disclosed that 75% of the center failed to use community resources as an integrated part of the curriculum. The activities and amount of time allotted to subject matter varied for centers serving the emotionally disturbed and socially maladjusted. These schools tended to emphasize academic subjects in the areas of reading, mathematics, social studies, and science. The programs focused upon the consolidation of basic skills and were looked upon as a continuation of the regular school year. With several schools, excursions were not an integral part of the school curriculum. Several centers provided trips as part of the day care program. However, little or no attempt was made to coordinate school and day care programs. When students went on these excursions their teachers were reassigned to another center. Use of community resources was generally restricted to recreation at a local park.

The center which served severly disturbed students tended to emphasize language development, gross and fine motor development, and social skills. Excellent use of community resources was demonstrated by the camp program. The curriculum was based upon the students experiences in the setting. These programs provided a therapeutic reality-oriented milieu and stressed active involvement with the real world. The use of community resources within each center is found in program descriptions.

Enrichment Activities

Objective: enrichment activities in the areas of art, music, library, health and family living should be adequate in 75% of the programs.

On site visitations, questionnaires, and interviews with teachers and principals revealed adequate provision for enrichment activities. Approximately 10%-15% of the schoolday was devoted to these activities. Programs generally emphasized arts and crafts, home economics, shop, and library. Many centers attempted to provide enrichment activities by departmentalization. Students were often able to choose among several alternatives. However, the departmentalization tended to separate the enrichment activities from academic subjects. In several instances creative teachers were able to develop students' interests and talents within the various subject matter areas. Students were actively involved in creative writing, writing of school newsletters, nature study projects, dramatic productions, and student made instructional materials. There was limited opportunity to pursue musical interests in most schools. Only one program was reported to include a health and family living unit as part of the curriculum. The varied enrichment activities within each center are found in the program descriptions.

Vocational Areas

Objective: industrial arts, vocational, and home-making activities should be adequate in 75% of the centers serving older students.

On site observations, questionnaires, and interviews with teachers and principals disclosed that provision for industrial arts, vocational, and home-making was not adequate at facilities serving a secondary school population. In two centers provisions were made for students to elect business subjects. The effectiveness of these classes was limited by typewriters badly in need of repair, outdated business machines, and lack of supplies. Two facilities provided an opportunity for participation in a work study program for students in financial need. Only one facility provided adequate industrial arts and vocational programs. The vocational opportunities within each center are listed in program descriptions.

Program Descriptions

The evaluation design required a combined analysis of the centers in the summer program. The results and conclusions drawn from such an analysis are often questionable or meaningless to the individual centers. The evaluation team felt that some attempt should be made to explore the many unique variables operating within each school setting. A program description was compiled for each of the 14 centers within the program. Information was obtained from questionnaires, on site visitations and interviews with principals, teachers and students. The variables considered were: age range; enrollment; educational level; diagnosis; physical setting; educational materials; curriculum; clinical services; parental involvement. (See Tables 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26.)

TABLE 13

NAME OF SCHOOL: BEACHBROOK NURSERY

AGE RANGE	ENROLLMENT	EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	DIAGNOSIS
2.9 - 6 years	15	Nursery	Severly Emotionally Disturbed

CLINICAL STAFF		PHYSICAL SETTING		EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS		PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT	
Agency Availability of staff	I	Storage	A	Student Made	E	Therapeutic	N
Non-Agency Availability of staff	NA	Space Within Building	A	Teacher Made	E	Family Group	N
Clinical Services continued after release	NA	Space Outside Building	A	Experiential	E	Parent Teacher Association	A
		Physical Safety	I	Manipulative	E	Home Management	N
		Shops	NA	Textbooks	A		
		Gym	N	Audio-Visual Aids	E		
		Auditorium	N	Supplies	A		
		Library	N				

CURRICULUM PHILOSOPHY		COMMUNITY RESOURCES		ENRICHMENT PROGRAM	
Social-Emotional Development	A	Playgrounds /parks	A	Trips	A
Intellectual Development	A	Museum	NA	Art	A
Motor Development	A	Theater,Cinema and Concerts	NA	Music	A
Behavior Modification	A			Library	I
No Focus				Physical Education	A

Legend: E-Excellent
N-None
A-Adequate
I-Inadequate
NA-Not Applicable

TABLE 14

NAME OF SCHOOL: CHILDREN'S DAY TREATMENT CENTER

AGE RANGE	ENROLLMENT	EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	DIAGNOSIS
5-9 years	25	Primary & Elementary	Emotionally Disturbed (moderately)

CLINICAL STAFF		PHYSICAL SETTING		EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS		PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT	
Agency		Storage	A	Student Made	A	Therapeutic	E
Availability of staff	A	Space Within Building	A	Teacher Made	A	Family Group	E
Non-Agency		Space Outside Building	I	Experiential	A	Parent Teacher Association	A
Availability of staff	I	Physical Safety	A	Manipulative	A	Home Management	NA
Clinical Services continued after release	NA	Shops	N	Textbooks	E		
		Gym	A	Audio-Visual Aids	A		
		Auditorium	A	Supplies	A		
		Library	A			Participation with clinical staff on a regular basis	A

CURRICULUM PHILOSOPHY		COMMUNITY RESOURCES		ENRICHMENT PROGRAM	
Social-Emotional Development	A	Playgrounds /parks	E	Trips	E
Intellectual Development	E	Museum		Art	A
Motor Development	I	Theater,Cinema and Concerts		Music	A
Behavior Modification	NA			Library	A
No Focus				Physical Education	A

Legend: E-Excellent
N-None
A-Adequate
I-Inadequate
NA-Not Applicable

TABLE 15

NAME OF SCHOOL: EUPHRASIAN II - PROJECT OUTREACH

AGE RANGE	ENROLLMENT	EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	DIAGNOSIS
13 - 16½ years	18 girls	Secondary	Socially Maladjusted Emotionally Disturbed

CLINICAL STAFF		PHYSICAL SETTING		EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS		BEHAVIOR MODIFICATION	
Agency		Storage	I	Very inadequate		Contract	E
Availability of staff	E	Space within building	I	Student made			
Non-Agency		Space outside building	I	Teacher made	Limited		
Availability of staff	N	Physical safety	A	Experiential	emphasis		
		Shops	N	Manipulative	I		
Family Group therapy	E	Gym	N	Textbooks	I		
Peer Group therapy		Auditorium	N	Reference Books	I		
Individual therapy provided weekly		Library	I	Maps	I		
Provision continuation upon completion education				Audio-Visual	I		
				Business machines	I		
				Supplies	I		

CURRICULUM PHILOSOPHY		COMMUNITY RESOURCES		ENRICHMENT PROGRAM		PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT
Social-Emotional Development	E	Playgrounds/parks	N	Trips	N	Excellent, parents take par in weekly family group therapy sessions
Intellectual	A	Museum	N	Art	A	
Academic	A	Theater, Cinema and Concerts	N	Music	A	
Business	A	Work-study (neighborhood youth corp)	E	Library	I	
Motor Development	N			Physical Education	N	
Behavior Modification Contract	E					

Legend: E-Excellent
N-None
A-Adequate
I-Inadequate
NA-Not Applicable

TABLE 16

NAME OF SCHOOL: HARLEM HOSPITAL

AGE RANGE	ENROLLMENT	EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	DIAGNOSIS
7 - 14 years	35	Elementary and Junior High School	Socially Maladjusted

CLINICAL STAFF		PHYSICAL SETTING		EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS		PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT	
Agency Availability of staff	A	Storage	A	Student Made	A	Therapeutic	A
Non-Agency Availability of staff	N	Space Within Building	A	Teacher Made	A	Family Group	A
Clinical Services continued after release	NA	Space Outside Building	I	Experiential	A	Parent Teacher Association	A
		Physical Safety	A	Manipulative	A	Home Management	N
		Shops	N	Textbooks	I		
		Gym	A	Audio-Visual Aids			
		Auditorium	N	Supplies	I		
		Library	A				
		Large Multipurpose Room	A				

CURRICULUM PHILOSOPHY		COMMUNITY RESOURCES		ENRICHMENT PROGRAM	
Social-Emotional Development	A	Playgrounds /parks	N	Trips	N
Intellectual Development	A	Museum	N	Art	A
Motor Development	A	Theater,Cinema and Concerts	N	Music	A
Behavior Modification	NA			Library	A
No Focus				Physical Education	A
				Trips provided by Day Care Teachers were re-assigned on these days.	

Legend: E-Excellent
N-None
A-Adequate
I-Inadequate
NA-Not Applicable

TABLE 17

NAME OF SCHOOL: HILLSIDE HOSPITAL SCHOOL

AGE RANGE	ENROLLMENT	EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	DIAGNOSIS
12 - 18 years	56	Secondary	Emotionally Disturbed and Severly Maladjusted

CLINICAL STAFF		PHYSICAL SETTING		EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS		PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT	
Agency Availability of staff	E	Storage	A	Student Made	A	Therapeutic	NA
Non-Agency Availability of staff	NA	Space Within Building	A	Teacher Made	A	Family Group	NA
Clinical Services continued after release	NA	Space Outside Building	E	Experiential	A	Parent Teacher Association	NA
		Physical Safety	A	Manipulative	A	Home Management	NA
		Shops	I	Textbooks	A		
		Gym	I	Audio-Visual Aids	A		
		Auditorium	I	Supplies	A		
		Library	I				

CURRICULUM PHILOSOPHY		COMMUNITY RESOURCES		ENRICHMENT PROGRAM	
Social-Emotional Development	A	Playgrounds /parks	I	Trips	A
Intellectual Development	A	Museum	NA	Art	A
Motor Development	A	Theater,Cinema and Concerts	NA	Music	A
Behavior Modification	A			Library	A
No Focus				Physical Education	A

Legend: E-Excellent
N-None
A-Adequate
I-Inadequate
NA-Not Applicable

TABLE 18

NAME OF SCHOOL: ITTELSON CENTER

AGE RANGE	ENROLLMENT	EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	DIAGNOSIS
6 - 13 years	26	Primary Elementary	Severely Emotionally Disturbed

CLINICAL STAFF	
Agency Availability of staff	A
Non-Agency Availability of staff	N
Clinical Services continued after release	NA

PHYSICAL SETTING	
Storage	A
Space Within Building	A
Space Outside Building	E
Physical Safety	A
Shops	E
Gym	E
Auditorium	A
Library	E

EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS	
Student Made	I
Teacher Made	I
Experiential	I
Manipulative	I
Textbooks	A
Audio-Visual Aids	A
Supplies	I

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT	
Therapeutic	E
Family Group	A
Parent Teacher Association	A
Home Management	NA

Parent participation c
regular basis with
clinical staff

CURRICULUM PHILOSOPHY	
Social-Emotional Development	A
Intellectual Development	A
Motor Development	A
Behavior Modification	Some
No Focus	

COMMUNITY RESOURCES	
Playgrounds /parks	I
Museum	I
Theater,Cinema and Concerts	I

ENRICHMENT PROGRAM	
Trips	I
Art	A
Music	A
Library	A
Physical Education	A

Legend: E-Excellent
N-None
A-Adequate
I-Inadequate
NA-Not Applicable

TABLE 19

NAME OF SCHOOL: LEAGUE SCHOOL AND RESEARCH CENTER

AGE RANGE	ENROLLMENT	EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	DIAGNOSIS
5 -10 years	31	Primary and Elementary	Severely Emotionally Disturbed (some children without language)

CLINICAL STAFF		PHYSICAL SETTING		EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS		PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT	
Agency		Storage	E	Student Made	A	Therapeutic	E
Availability of staff	E	Space Within Building	E	Teacher Made	E	Family Group	E
Non-Agency		Space Outside Building	A	Experiential	E	Parent Teacher Association	E
Availability of staff	A	Physical Safety	A	Manipulative	E	Home Management	E
Clinical Services continued after release	E	Shops	NA	Textbooks	E		
		Gym	E	Audio-Visual Aids	E		
		Auditorium	A	Supplies	E		
		Library	A				

CURRICULUM PHILOSOPHY		COMMUNITY RESOURCES		ENRICHMENT PROGRAM	
Social-Emotional Development	E	Playgrounds /parks	E	Trips	E
Intellectual Development	E	Museum	NA	Art	E
Motor Development	E	Theater,Cinema and Concerts	NA	Music	E
Behavior Modification	A			Library	E
No Focus				Physical Education	A

Legend: E-Excellent
N-None
A-Adequate
I-Inadequate
NA-Not Applicable

TABLE 20

NAME OF SCHOOL: LIFELINE CENTER FOR CHILD DEVELOPMENT

AGE RANGE	ENROLLMENT	EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	DIAGNOSIS
4.9 - 12 years	32	Nursery and Primary	Severely Emotionally Disturbed (children without language)

CLINICAL STAFF		PHYSICAL SETTING		EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS		PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT	
Agency Availability of staff	E	Storage	I	Student Made	E	Therapeutic	A
Non-Agency Availability of staff	NA	Space Within Building	I	Teacher Made	E	Family Group	A
Clinical Services continued after release	E	Space Outside Building	I	Experiential	E	Parent Teacher Association	A
		Physical Safety	I	Manipulative	E	Home Management	A
		Shops	NA	Textbooks	A		
		Gym	I	Audio-Visual Aids	A		
		Auditorium	I	Supplies	E		
		Library	I				

CURRICULUM PHILOSOPHY		COMMUNITY RESOURCES		ENRICHMENT PROGRAM	
Social-Emotional Development	E	Playgrounds /parks	A	Trips	A
Intellectual Development	E	Museum	NA	Art	E
Motor Development	E	Theater,Cinema and Concerts	NA	Music	E
Behavior Modification	E			Library	A
No Focus				Physical Education	A

Legend: E-Excellent
N-None
A-Adequate
I-Inadequate
NA-Not Applicable

TABLE 21

NAME OF SCHOOL: MANHATTAN SCHOOL RESIDENTIAL CAMP PROGRAM

AGE RANGE	ENROLLMENT	EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	DIAGNOSIS
7 - 15 years	30	Elementary and Junior	Severely Emotionally Disturbed

CLINICAL STAFF	
Agency Availability of staff	NA
Non-Agency Availability of staff	NA
Clinical Services continued after release	NA

PHYSICAL SETTING	
Storage	I
Space Within Building	I
Space Outside Building	E
Physical Safety	A
Shops	N
Gym	N
Auditorium	N
Library	I

EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS	
Student Made	E
Teacher Made	E
Experiential	E
Manipulative	E
Textbooks-minimal reliance	NA
Audio-Visual Aids	
Supplies	A

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT	
Therapeutic	NA
Family Group	NA
Parent Teacher Association	A
Home Management	NA

Active involvement in camp program supported partially by the Parent Association for Mentally Ill Children

CURRICULUM PHILOSOPHY	
Social-Emotional Development	E
Intellectual Development	A
Motor Development	E
Behavior Modification	NA
No Focus	NA

COMMUNITY RESOURCES	
Playgrounds /parks	NA
Museum	NA
Theater, Cinema and Concerts	NA
Camp grounds	E
Swimming	E
Hiking	E
Boating	E

ENRICHMENT PROGRAM	
Trips	E(HIKES)
Art	E
Music	A
Library	I
Physical Education	E

Legend: E-Excellent
N-None
A-Adequate
I-Inadequate
NA-Not Applicable

TABLE 22

NAME OF SCHOOL: MT. SINAI HOSPITAL

AGE RANGE	ENROLLMENT	EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	DIAGNOSIS
8 - 17 years	24	Junior and Secondary (for the most part)	Emotionally Disturbed Socially Maladjusted

CLINICAL STAFF	
Hospital	
Availability of staff	A
Non-**hospital**	
Availability of staff	N
Clinical Services continued after release	NA

PHYSICAL SETTING	
Storage	I
Space Within Building	A
Space Outside Building	I
Physical Safety	A
Shops	E
Gym	E
Auditorium	E
Library	A

EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS	
Student Made	E
Teacher Made	A
Experiential	E
Manipulative	A
Textbooks	I
Audio-Visual Aids	A
Supplies	I
Business machines	I

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT	
Therapeutic	NA
Family Group	A
Parent Teacher Association	NA
Home Management	NA

CURRICULUM PHILOSOPHY	
Social-Emotional Development	A
Intellectual Development	A
Motor Development	A
Behavior Modification	NA
No Focus	

COMMUNITY RESOURCES	
Playgrounds /parks	N
Museum	N
Theater,Cinema and Concerts	N

ENRICHMENT PROGRAM		
Trips	N	(PART OF HOSPITAL PROGRAM)
Art	A	
Music	A	
Library	A	
Physical Education	A	

Legend: E-Excellent
N-None
A-Adequate
I-Inadequate
NA-Not Applicable

TABLE 23

NAME OF SCHOOL: NEW YORK PSYCHIATRIC INSTITUTE

AGE RANGE	ENROLLMENT	EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	DIAGNOSIS
8 - 18 years	varies from 25 - 35	Junior and Secondary	Emotionally Disturbed

CLINICAL STAFF		PHYSICAL SETTING		EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS		PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT	
Agency Availability of staff	I	Storage	I	Student Made	A	Therapeutic	NA
Non-Agency Availability of staff	NA	Space Within Building	I	Teacher Made	A	Family Group	NA
Clinical Services continued after release	NA	Space Outside Building	I	Experiential	I	Parent Teacher Association	NA
		Physical Safety	A	Manipulative	I	Home Management	NA
		Shops	I	Textbooks	A		
		Gym	I	Audio-Visual Aids	I		
		Auditorium	A	Supplies	A		
		Library	A				

CURRICULUM PHILOSOPHY		COMMUNITY RESOURCES		ENRICHMENT PROGRAM	
Social-Emotional Development	A	Playgrounds /parks	A	Trips	I
Intellectual Development	A	Museum	I	Art	I
Motor Development	A	Theater,Cinema and Concerts	I	Music	I
Behavior Modification	A			Library	I
No Focus				Physical Education	I

Legend: E-Excellent
N-None
A-Adequate
I-Inadequate
NA-Not Applicable

TABLE 24

NAME OF SCHOOL: PHOENIX SCHOOL

AGE RANGE	ENROLLMENT	EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	DIAGNOSIS
13 - 16 years	9	Secondary	Socially Maladjusted

CLINICAL STAFF		PHYSICAL SETTING		EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS		PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT	
Agency		Storage	I	Student Made	A	Therapeutic	NA
Availability of staff	A	Space Within Building	I	Teacher Made	A	Family Group	NA
Non-Agency Availability of staff	NA	Space Outside Building	I	Experiential	A	Parent Teacher Association	NA
Clinical Services continued after release	NA	Physical Safety	A	Manipulative	A	Home Management	NA
		Shops	I	Textbooks	A		
		Gym	I	Audio-Visual Aids	A		
		Auditorium	I	Supplies	A		
		Library	I				

CURRICULUM PHILOSOPHY		COMMUNITY RESOURCES		ENRICHMENT PROGRAM	
Social-Emotional Development	A	Playgrounds /parks	A	Trips	E
Intellectual Development	A	Museum	E	Art	A
Motor Development	A	Theater,Cinema and Concerts	E	Music	A
Behavior Modification	A			Library	A
No Focus				Physical Education	A

Legend: E-Excellent
N-None
A-Adequate
I-Inadequate
NA-Not Applicable

TABLE 25

NAME OF SCHOOL: RIKER'S ISLAND SCHOOL P.S. 189 BRONX

AGE RANGE	ENROLLMENT	EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	DIAGNOSIS
16 - 21 years	varies from 170 - 250	Secondary	Socially Maladjusted

CLINICAL STAFF		PHYSICAL SETTING		EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS		PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT	
Agency Availability of staff	N	Storage	A	Student Made	A	Therapeutic	NA
Non-Agency Availability of staff	A	Space Within Building	A	Teacher Made	E	Family Group	NA
Clinical Services continued after release	NA	Space Outside Building	NA	Experiential	E	Parent Teacher Association	NA
		Physical Safety	A	Manipulative	A	Home Management	NA
		Shops	A	Textbooks	A		
		Gym	A	Audio-Visual Aids	A		
		Auditorium	A	Supplies	A		
		Library	A				

CURRICULUM PHILOSOPHY		COMMUNITY RESOURCES		ENRICHMENT PROGRAM	
Social-Emotional Development	A	Playgrounds /parks	NA	Trips	NA
Intellectual Development	A	Museum	NA	Art	A
Motor Development	NA	Theater,Cinema and Concerts	NA	Music	A
Behavior Modification	A			Library	A
No Focus				Physical Education	A

Legend: E-Excellent
N-None
A-Adequate
I-Inadequate
NA-Not Applicable

TABLE 26

NAME OF SCHOOL: STATEN ISLAND MENTAL HEALTH CENTER

AGE RANGE	ENROLLMENT	EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	DIAGNOSIS
5 - 10 years	23	Primary and Elementary	Severely Emotionally Disturbed

CLINICAL STAFF		PHYSICAL SETTING		EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS		PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT	
Agency Availability of staff	NA	Storage	A	Student Made	E	Therapeutic	A
Non-Agency Availability of staff	E	Space Within Building	A	Teacher Made	E	Family Group	A
Clinical Services continued after release	NA	Space Outside Building	A	Experiential	E	Parent Teacher Association	A
		Physical Safety	A	Manipulative	E	Home Management	A
		Shops	NA	Textbooks	E		
		Gym	A	Audio-Visual Aids	E		
		Auditorium	N	Supplies	A		
		Library	A				

CURRICULUM PHILOSOPHY		COMMUNITY RESOURCES		ENRICHMENT PROGRAM	
Social-Emotional Development	E	Playgrounds /parks	E	Trips	A
Intellectual Development	E	Museum	NA	Art	A
Motor Development	E	Theater,Cinema and Concerts	NA	Music	A
Behavior Modification	A			Library	A
No Focus				Physical Education	A

Legend: E-Excellent
N-None
A-Adequate
I-Inadequate
NA-Not Applicable

Chapter VI EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACHES

Curriculum

Interviews with school personnel and on site visitations revealed that many of the schools lacked a clearly articulated philosophy of education. In most cases classroom organization reflected the teacher's personal philosophy. Classroom organization, methods and materials varied greatly from class to class within each center. Students were often exposed to different types of learning environments in one morning. In only a few instances did schools espouse specific educational orientations for their population and set clearly defined goals. Teachers in these programs were carefully screened in order to ensure consistency in methods and program.

The emphasis in the curriculum varied according to the needs of the students served. Schools working with the severly disturbed elementary child sought to enable the child to function more adequately within his environment. Many stressed language development. The primary emphasis in the elementary level programs serving the socially maladjusted and emotionally disturbed was on reading and mathematics. The programs serving the secondary level population focused upon English and mathematics with less emphasis on social studies and science. Most programs were academically oriented with limited opportunity for vocational training. Only two centers provided opportunity for students to take either business subjects or industrial arts. Only a few centers offered a work-study program for the students.

Generally the schools served by the Summer Title I program can be characterized as being innovative or traditional or eclectic in their approaches. The following list describes some approaches which affected how these schools functioned:

1. One nursery school program grouped emotionally disturbed and brain injured children in with normal children.

2. Programs for K-6 children which were mainly involved with basis perceptual motor and sensory motor learning used an experiential approach.

3. Behavior modification techniques, although not obvious, were used. Token reinforcement, positive and negative reinforcement, were frequently used. In one class positive reinforcement was used in an open classroom program.

4. Workshops with parents for home management and home treatment were an important part of a few programs.

5. Out-of-school vocational training was tried for some students in the secondary schools. Family life and sex education were also programmed at the secondary school level.

6. A crisis counselor and a special crisis room were available in some facilities.

7. A family concept was transmitted in some schools by children and professionals eating, taking trips, and playing games together.

8. Many children had the opportunity of using a pool facility. This was an important cooling off activity as well as an important opportunity for social and emotional growth.

9. Students acted as tutors with other students.

10. Programs had free choice activities during certain hours.

11. Prescriptive directive teaching.

Instructional Materials

On site visitations, questionnaires, and interviews with principals and teachers revealed that limited funds were available for supplies and instructional materials. Due to the late funding of this project, materials ordered were either unavailable or arrived at the end of the program. In most instances supplies ordered were provided from the regular program and replaced when the order arrived.

The type and amount of commercial materials available at each center varied greatly and displayed no pattern. This is to be expected due to the different needs of students at each center. However, most centers seemed to lack suitable books, equipment, and the supplies needed adequately to individualize instruction.

Many teachers brought materials which they found successful during the regular school year. The majority of teachers relied heavily upon home-made teaching materials. Many teachers alluded to the fact the utilization of specific instructional materials was the underlying reason for the program's uniqueness. Some of the equipment and materials listed as being important to the programs are as follows:

1. Macrame, basketry, and ceramics.

2. Bean bags, obstacle course, portable gym equipment.

3. Puppetry, materials for play therapy.

4. Audio-visual program: tape recorders, film projectors and videotape recorders and projectors.

5. Programmed materials, reading laboratory equipment.

6. Overhead projectors, filmstrips, and slides.

7. Educational games and manipulative educational devices.

8. Computers, abacus, clock face, balance scales.

9. Language master, puzzles, and trade books.

10. Paints, clay, found materials, and musical instruments.

Chapter VII SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Based upon the information obtained from questionnaires, observational checklists, rating scales, on site observations and interviews with administrators, teachers, clinical staff and students, the evaluation team has concluded that this summer program should be recycled next year. It provided vital service to socially maladjusted and emotionally disturbed students.

The results of the evaluation indicated that this Title I supported summer program achieved and in some cases surpassed the expectations for the pupil outcome objectives.

Pupil Outcome - Achievement: 72% of all students who attended 18 or more summer sessions were rated as improved in reading; 17.4% of these pupils sustained (remained the same) their level of achievement; and .3% regressed. In the area of mathematics, 69% of all students who attended 18 or more summer sessions were rated as improved; 20.1% sustained (remained the same) their level of achievement; and .6% reportedly regressed.

It was found that 45.4% of all students who attended 18 or fewer summer sessions were rated as improved in reading; 30.9% of these students sustained their level of achievement; and 1.8% regressed. In the area of mathematics, 40% of all students who attended 18 or fewer summer sessions were rated as improved; 29.2% of these students sustained their level of achievement; and 7.8% regressed.

Pupil Outcome: Students who attended 18 or more sessions of the summer program demonstrated an improved Asocial Index T score on the Jesness Inventory.

Of the sampled elementary school population 56.6% were rated as improved in social and emotional functioning; 41.5% remained the same; and 1.9% regressed.

The program process objectives were not all achieved by the summer program.

Supportive Services: 75% of the facilities failed to provide adequate supportive services for the program.

Community Resources: 75% of the facilities did not adequately integrate community resources into the summer program.

Enrichment Activities: 75% of the facilities did include adequate cultural and enrichment activities in the areas of art, music, library, health and family living.

Vocational Areas: 75% of the facilities serving secondary school students failed to provide for adequate industrial arts, vocational and home-making activities.

Recommendation Regarding Funding, Time Schedule, and Staff

Based upon its findings, the evaluation team recommends:

1. Notification of funding should be made at an earlier date to allow sufficient time for selection of staff and ordering of instructional materials.

2. With centers having afternoon sessions, provision should be made to coordinate part-time administrators' work hours with the scheduled hours of the centers. The geographical proximity of the various cluster schools assigned to an administrator should also be taken into account.

3. Provision should be made for orientation and planning time for teachers and administrators new to each center in order to provide better continuity in instruction.

4. More efficient payroll procedure should be put into effect. (Teachers were to be paid on a semimonthly basis over the summer but some teachers' payroll forms were improperly handled resulting in payment being held up till the end of the summer.)

5. Time be allotted each week for teachers to consult with professional staff to promote better communication between school and agency.

6. The practice of hiring teachers who were employed should be continued during the school year in the same schools. This same continuity with regard to the clinical staff and social workers or guidance counselors should be maintained over the summer.

7. Provision should be made for more supportive services (guidance counselor, school psychologists) at several of the facilities. Expansion of guidance services for the Riker's Island site particularly, appears warranted.

Recommendation Regarding Curriculum and Instructional Materials and Facilities

8. Funds should be allocated to upgrade instructional materials at certain centers. Attention should be directed toward the acquisiton of appropriate materials to allow for more individualized instruction. Materials in reading, mathematics, science, social studies and English should be supplemented with individualized labs and programmed materials.

9. Greater use should be made of community resources within the school program. Facilities at Holm, New York, might be used by other centers on a short-term basis when the Manhattan School Camp is not in session.

10. Attention and study should be given to curriculum innovation. This might be accomplished by means of in-service workshops or inclusion of a curriculum specialist. Increased opportunities should be provided for students to manipulate materials with more emphasis on the process of learning.

11. A supplementary fund (petty cash) should be set up in order that teachers may use this for minor instructional materials when needs arise during the program.

12. The work-study program should be extended to include additional centers service a non-residential secondary school population.

13. Teachers should avail themselves of the materials and services offered by the Special Education Instructional Material Center to upgrade and enrich instruction.

14. Each unit or school should have clearly defined goals which are based upon a sound philosophy of education.

15. Facilities which are makeshift and/or drab and/or lacking safety measures needed for disoriented children should be upgraded.

16. Facilities having a large proportion of Spanish-speaking students should have bilingual instructions.

APPENDIX A

EVALUATION OF THE SUMMER PROGRAM
FOR SOCIALLY MALADJUSTED AND
EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CHILDREN

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT FORM

School: _____ Date: _____

Teacher: _____ Age of Pupils: _____

Number of Pupils Enrolled: _____ Present: _____

I. Description of Program

1. Indicate the type of pupil which the program is serving.

_____

_____

2. Describe, generally, the program which is being provided for this type of pupil.

_____

_____

II. Physical Setting

1. How appropriate is the physical setting for the pupils?

_____

_____

2. Given the physical conditions, how does teacher use available space in order to facilitate learning activities.

_____

_____

3. Is there a variety of vocational equipment for the shop program? Describe the equipment.

_____

_____

APPENDIX A continued

EVALUATION OF THE SUMMER PROGRAM
FOR SOCIALLY MALADJUSTED AND
EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CHILDREN

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT FORM

III. Equipment and Materials

1. What commercial materials were used or were available in the room during your observation?

_____

_____

2. What teacher or pupil-made materials were used or available for use?

_____

_____

IV. Curriculum Experience

1. Indicate the nature of any learning experiences and the interaction among pupils, between teacher and pupils, etc., which you observed.

_____

_____

_____

2. To what extent is teacher able to get pupils to participate in academic learning experience?

_____

_____

3. To what extent does the teacher build upon pupils' previous experience?

_____

_____

4. To what extent does the teacher maintain and develop rapport?

_____

_____

APPENDIX A continued

EVALUATION OF THE SUMMER PROGRAM
FOR SOCIALLY MALADJUSTED AND
EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CHILDREN

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT FORM

5. To what extent does the teacher provide individual differences?

_____

_____

6. To what extent does the teacher show evidence of favoritism?

_____

_____

V. Social and Emotional Development

1. To what extent does teacher stimulate pupils' positive relationship with peers and adults?

_____

2. Does the teacher seem to understand the dynamics of the students and is her handling appropriate to the situation?

_____

3. To what extent does the teacher help develop pupils' ability to tolerate frustration and anxiety?

_____

_____

4. To what extent does the teacher help to develop pupils' ability to function without supervision?

_____

_____

5. To what extent does teacher stimulate pupils' participation in group activities?

_____

_____

APPENDIX A continued

EVALUATION OF THE SUMMER PROGRAM
FOR SOCIALLY MALADJUSTED AND
EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CHILDREN

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT FORM

6. To what extent does teacher help pupils to develop a positive self-image?

_____

_____

7. To what extent does the teacher help pupils to develop some effective self-control?

_____

_____

8. Have the teachers read the pupils' confidential file and other school records? _____

VI. Educational Aide

1. Was an educational aide assigned to the class?

_____

2. If so, what were her responsibilities?

_____

_____

3. To what extent did the teacher and educational aide work together as a team?

_____

_____

VII. Other Professionals

1. Do teachers have contact with other professionals?

_____

APPENDIX A continued

EVALUATION OF THE SUMMER PROGRAM
FOR SOCIALLY MALADJUSTED AND
EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CHILDREN

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT FORM

2. If so, what was the nature of the interaction?

_____

_____

VIII. Parents

1. Do teachers have contact with parents?

_____

2. If so, describe nature of contact.

_____

_____

IX. Summary Ratings

1. How effective is this teacher in promoting academic or cognitive development of the pupils?

_____

_____

2. How effective is this teacher in promoting the social-economical development of the pupils?

_____

_____

3. How effective is this teacher in promoting physical or motor development of pupils?

_____

_____

APPENDIX A continued

EVALUATION OF THE SUMMER PROGRAM
FOR SOCIALLY MALADJUSTED AND
EMOTIONALLY DISTRUBED CHILDREN

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT FORM

4. Which of the following appear to be main focus of the program:

a) Intellectual Development
b) Social-Emotional Development
c) Motor Development
d) No focus apparent

X. Other Comments

_____

_____

_____

TEACHING & LEARNING

APPENDIX B

EVALUATION OF THE SUMMER PROGRAM
FOR SOCIALLY MALADJUSTED AND
EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CHILDREN

STUDENT VITAL STATISTICS AND STUDENT PERFORMANCE DATA

Name of Student _____ Sex _____

Name of Teacher _____ Class or Grade ____

School _____

No. of Days Present _____ No. of Days Absent _____

Most Recent Grade Equivalency Achievement Score in Reading _____

Most Recent Grade Equivalency Achievement Score in Math _____

	Circle One:			
		Improved		Improved
		Same		Same
		Regressed		Regressed
		Undetermined		Undetermined
Pupil Performance Data:	Reading	_____	Math	_____

Psychiatric Diagnosis _____

Attitudinal Scale _____% Positive _____% Negative _____%

Teacher's Comments _____

_____

_____

APPENDIX C

EVALUATION OF THE SUMMER PROGRAM
FOR SOCIALLY MALADJUSTED AND
EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CHILDREN

STAFF INFORMATION SHEET

Name of Staff Member _____ Title _____

School _____

Class or grade (if appropriate) _____

No. of years in this position _____

Is this summer position the same as the one you have during the school year?

Yes ____ No ____

Highest educational level _____

Fields of specialization _____

Average time spent with each student under your supervision each day _____

Describe your role as you see it in the summer program. Please be as specific as possible. _____

_____

What innovative methods, techniques, materials, and/or equipment are being used by you in this program? _____

What is the percentage of time given over to recreation in this program? _____

Are you using any behavior modification techniques in classroom? Check as many as are being used.

_____ contract	_____ token	_____ positive reinforcement
_____ fixed awards	_____ delayed gratification	_____ negative reinforcement
_____ variable awards	_____ instant gratification	

What changes would you make to improve the summer program? _____

_____

APPENDIX C continued

EVALUATION OF THE SUMMER PROGRAM
FOR SOCIALLY MALADJUSTED AND
EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CHILDREN

STAFF INFORMATION SHEET

Have procedural matters in hiring, pay and responsibilities been made clear to you? _____ Yes _____ No

Are you aware that the summer program is a Title I Program? _____ Yes _____ No

APPENDIX D

EVALUATION OF THE SUMMER PROGRAM
FOR SOCIALLY MALADJUSTED AND
EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CHILDREN

ADMINISTRATOR'S SHEET

Name: _____ Title: _____

School: _____ Administrator: _____

I. Recruitment and Hiring

1. What is your role during the regular school year?

_____

_____

2. How does this role qualify you for your position during this summer program?

_____

_____

II. Duties and Responsibilities

1. What are your duties and responsibilities during this summer program,
e. g., hiring of staff, supervision, etc.? _____

_____

_____

_____

2. What problems have you encountered in fulfilling these duties? _____

_____

_____

_____

III. Organization and Implementation

1. How was this summer program organized and implemented in your school district? _____

APPENDIX D continued

EVALUATION OF THE SUMMER PROGRAM
FOR SOCIALLY MALADJUSTED AND
EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CHILDREN

ADMINISTRATOR'S SHEET

2. What problems have you encountered in the organization and implementation of the summer program? _____

_____

IV. Goals of the Program

1. What do you see are the goals of the summer program as implemented in your school? _____

_____

2. What problems have you encountered in implementing those goals? _____

_____

_____

V. Summary

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Were there any in-service or reeducation courses provided by the Board of Education before or during this program? _____ Yes _____ No

No. of professionals in each area:

_____ Total population of teachers in the summer program

_____ Total number of social workers in the summer program

_____ Total number of guidance personnel in the summer program

_____ Total number of psychologists in the summer program

APPENDIX D continued

EVALUATION OF THE SUMMER PROGRAM
FOR SOCIALLY MALADJUSTED AND
EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CHILDREN

ADMINISTRATOR'S SHEET

_____ Total number of nurses in the summer program

_____ Total number of psychiatrists in the summer program

_____ Total number of attendance workers in the summer program

_____ Total number of remedial reading and math specialists in the program

_____ Total number of community coordinators in the summer program

No. of students in each age range:

_____ Below age 6

_____ Below age 8

_____ Below age 10

_____ Below age 12

_____ Below age 14

_____ Below age 16

_____ Below age 18

_____ Above age 18

No. of para-professionals in the program: _____

No. of volunteers in the program: _____

APPENDIX E

EVALUATION OF THE SUMMER PROGRAM
FOR SOCIALLY MALADJUSTED AND
EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CHILDREN

OBSERVATION REPORT

Teacher _____ Date _____

Class _____ Room _____

E - Excellent I - Needs Improvement

S - Satisfactory U - Unsatisfactory

LESSON	AREA			
1. Placement of Teacher	E	S	I	U
2. Seating of Students Formal _____ Informal _____	E	S	I	U
3. Attitude of Students	E	S	I	U
4. Condition of Students	E	S	I	U
a. Table surfaces	E	S	I	U
b. Materials	E	S	I	U
c. Bulletin boards	E	S	I	U
d. Windows	E	S	I	U
e. Floors	E	S	I	U
5. Student Materials	E	S	I	U
a. Appropriate levels of texts	E	S	I	U
b. Writing materials	E	S	I	U
6. Teacher manner	E	S	I	U
7. Knowledge of Subject	E	S	I	U
8. Teacher Mobility	E	S	I	U
9. Methodology	E	S	I	U
a. Lesson aim clear	E	S	I	U

APPENDIX E continued

EVALUATION OF THE SUMMER PROGRAM
FOR SOCIALLY MALADJUSTED AND
EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CHILDREN

OBSERVATION REPORT

LESSON	AREA			
b. Sequence observed	E	S	I	U
c. Structure provided	E	S	I	U
d. Ratio of written vs. oral	E	S	I	U
e. Ratio of silent vs. oral	E	S	I	U
f. Use of board and visual aid	E	S	I	U
g. Use of text, extra books	E	S	I	U
h. Use of workbook	E	S	I	U
i. Use of notebook	E	S	I	U

STUDENT PARTICIPATION

1. Recognition of individual differences	E	S	I	U
2. Student exchange	E	S	I	U
3. Specific skill development	E	S	I	U
4. Personalization needs met	E	S	I	U
5. Standardized needs met	E	S	I	U
6. Allowances for weaknesses	E	S	I	U
7. Utilization of strengths	E	S	I	U
8. Sub-groups vs. whole group	E	S	I	U
9. Use of test or check device	E	S	I	U

APPENDIX E continued

EVALUATION OF THE SUMMER PROGRAM
FOR SOCIALLY MALADJUSTED
AND EMOTIONALLY DISTURBED CHILDREN

OBSERVATION REPORT

CURRICULUM

Check list below of items observed in the Program

1. Tutoring in the Classroom
2. Active involvement of pupil personnel staff in classroom
3. Group guidance
4. Prescriptive teaching
5. Skills center
6. Math Laboratory
7. Reading Laboratory
8. Objectives of less accomplished

TEACHING & LEARNING

APPENDIX F

"MY SUMMER SCHOOL" QUESTIONNAIRE

	YES	SOMETIMES	NO
1. The teachers in this school want to help you.	_____	_____	_____
2. The teachers in this school expect you to work too hard.	_____	_____	_____
3. The teachers in this school are really interested in you.	_____	_____	_____
4. The teachers in this school know how to explain things clearly.	_____	_____	_____
5. The teachers in this school are fair and square.	_____	_____	_____
6. The boys and girls in this school fight too much.	_____	_____	_____
7. This school building is a pleasant place.	_____	_____	_____
8. The principal in this school is friendly.	_____	_____	_____
9. The work at this school is too hard.	_____	_____	_____
10. What I am learning will be useful to me.	_____	_____	_____
11. The trip to and from school is too long.	_____	_____	_____
12. I wish I didn't have to go to school at all.	_____	_____	_____

APPENDIX F continued

"MY SUMMER SCHOOL" QUESTIONNAIRE

	YES	SOMETIMES	NO
14. The work at this school is too easy.	_____	_____	_____
15. I work hard in school but don't seem to get anywhere.	_____	_____	_____
16. My teacher helps me when I need it.	_____	_____	_____
17. Going to school is one of the most important things you can do.	_____	_____	_____
18. The boys and girls in my class are pretty nice.	_____	_____	_____
19. My parents never listen when I talk to them about school.	_____	_____	_____
20. When I need to talk to someone, the guidance counselor or the psychologist or social worker in this program is always available.	_____	_____	_____

APPENDIX G

TEACHER RATING OF SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL GROWTH SCALE

Name: _____ Date: _____

School: _____

To the Teacher:

As part of the evaluation of Title I services provided to emotionally disturbed and socially maladjusted children during the summer of 1972, please respond to the following questions by checking the 1-5 scale below:

Name of student: _____

No. of sessions attended: _____

"As compared to the beginning of the summer program."

a. How does the pupil relate to peers and school personnel?

1	2	3	4	5
much worse		about the same		much better

b. How does the pupil tolerate frustration and anxiety?

1	2	3	4	5
much worse		about the same		much better

c. How has the pupil's ability to socialize with peers changed?

1	2	3	4	5
much worse		about the same		much better

d. How does the pupil function without supervision?

1	2	3	4	5
much worse		about the same		much better

e. How has the pupil's self-image changed?

1	2	3	4	5
much worse		about the same		much better

APPENDIX G **continued**

TEACHER RATING OF SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL GROWTH SCALE

f. How has the pupil's self-control changed?

1	2	3	4	5
much worse		about the same		much better

APPENDIX H

THE JESNESS INVENTORY

This psychological scale is copyrighted. Copies may be obtained from:

Consulting Psychologists Press
577 College Ave.
Palo Alto, Calif.